

Application Serial No.: 09/536,022
Reply to Office Action dated September 23, 2005

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-4, 7-11, 13-15, 18-22, 24-26, 29-33, 37-39, and 43-66 are presently active in this case.

The Applicant notes that the listing of pending claims on the Office Action Summary is incorrect. Namely, Claims 40-42 were previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and therefore these claims should not be listed as being pending. Additionally, the Applicant notes that the listing of allowed claims on the Office Action Summary and the listing of allowed claims on page 3 of the Official Action are incorrect. Namely, Claims 5 and 6 were previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and therefore these claims should not be listed as being allowed.

Pending Claims 2-4, 7-10, 13-15, 18-21, 24-26, 29-32, 37-39, 43, 51, and 59 are allowed.

In the outstanding Official Action, Claims 11, 22, 33, 44-50, 52-58, and 60-66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Official Action indicates that the limitation regarding “a member to cover and uncover said lens by sliding in a vertical direction at the upper edge of the front of said camera body” was not originally disclosed. The Applicant respectfully and vigorously traverses this rejection.

At the outset, the Applicant notes that the originally filed included dependent Claims 11, 22, and 33, which each recited the above limitation. Furthermore, the Applicant notes

Application Serial No.: 09/536,022
Reply to Office Action dated September 23, 2005

that the originally filed specification provides clear written description of the embodiment recited in these claims. For example, page 7, line 16, through page 8, line 3, clearly describes an embodiment in which the cover (5) is configured to slide in the left and right directions. (See also original Claims 10, 21, and 32). Then, the original specification continues on page 8, lines 3-5, by stating that “[f]urther, it can be configured such that the lens/strobe flash cover 5 is slid in the directions of up and down instead of left and right.” This disclosure provides clear written description of the embodiment recited in Claims 11, 22, and 33. This statement in conjunction with the remaining description of the camera set forth throughout the originally filed specification clearly provides written description of the claimed features in such a way as to reasonably convey to one of ordinary skill in the art that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention at the time the application was filed. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the written description rejection.

Consequently, in view of the above discussion, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of this application is therefore requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Registration No. 25,599
Attorney of Record

Christopher D. Ward
Registration No. 41,367

Customer Number

22850

Tel. (703) 413-3000
Fax. (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 10/01)

GJM:CDW:brf

I:\atty\cdw\0557\05574901\am5.doc